

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

JASON R. CRAWFORD,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
v.)	No. 3:06-1117
)	JUDGE ECHOLS
STEPHEN DOTSON, WARDEN,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court are the *pro se* Petition For [Great] Writ of Habeas Corpus Relief (Docket Entry No. 1), under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, Respondent's Answer (Docket Entry No. 11), and the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") entered by the United States Magistrate Judge on May 7, 2007 (Docket Entry No. 13), to which no objections have been filed.

In reviewing an R&R, the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b). The Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing the habeas petition because the Petitioner failed to exhaust the claims outlined in the federal petition in his state post-conviction proceedings and thus, the claims are procedurally defaulted.

Having carefully reviewed the entire record in this case, the Court finds that no error of fact or law appears in the R&R. Accordingly, the Court rules as follows:

(1) The R&R of the Magistrate Judge (Docket Entry No. 13) is hereby ACCEPTED.

(2) The Petition For [Great] Writ of Habeas Corpus Relief (Docket Entry No. 1) is hereby DENIED because the claims are procedurally defaulted.

(3) This case is hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

(4) Entry of this Order on the docket shall constitute entry of final Judgment in accordance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 58 and 79(a).

(5) Because Petitioner cannot demonstrate that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the Court was correct in its procedural default ruling, a Certificate of Appealability will not issue. See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



ROBERT L. ECHOLS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE